

~~SECRET~~

CIA CAREER COUNCIL

56th Meeting

30 April 1959

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

I-N-D-E-X

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page(s)</u>
Candidates for Harvard & Industrial War College	1 - 5
Approval of Minutes of last Meeting (55th Meeting)	4
Abolition of 5% [in Training] Rule	4
Overtime Compensation Policy	5 - 6
Separations Regulation	6 - 12
Regulation re Management of Personnel, Grades 1 thru 15. .	12 - 19
Civilian Reserve Programs	19 - 22
Civil Service matters.	22 - 25
Agency Retirement Board	25 - 31
Use of Grades 6, 8, & 10	31 - 38
Selection Board recommendation re Career Staff Suspension of Persons Nominated for Separation. . . .	38 - 40

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

. The 56th meeting of the CIA Career Council
convened at 3:00 p.m. on Thursday, 30 April 1959, in the DCI's Conference
Room, with the following present:

Gordon M. Stewart, Chairman
Matthew Baird, Member
[REDACTED] Member
Lyman B. Kirkpatrick, Member
H. Gates Lloyd, Alternate Member
[REDACTED] Alternate Member
[REDACTED] Executive Secretary
Lawrence R. Houston, Guest
[REDACTED] Recorder

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. STEWART: Let me start, very quickly, first with the
candidates for Harvard and the Industrial War College. There have been
two candidates advanced, to my knowledge, [REDACTED] for the Industrial
College and [REDACTED] for Harvard. I think in the case of [REDACTED] the
question is whether we want to nominate at this time a second candidate.
I don't think these individuals need any introduction to the Board--
certainly not Brent.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think, Gordon, in that connection, I
should pass on a comment the Director made to me last week. He had been
talking to Red about the Harvard course--I don't know whether you got
this back yet or not, Matt--and he made a comment about the fact that
he thought, on the basis of his conversations with Red, that we should
make sure the people we are sending are: (a) right out of the top level
of the Agency, and (b) are prepared to and will be capable of developing
the contacts with these businessmen the way Red has been able to--
following up on it.

Now, I think [REDACTED] comes close to this.

MR. STEWART: There's another point to make--and I think Matt
has this--that in your view, Matt, it is not advisable to put anyone
forward unless we are absolutely "red hot" to get that person in at
this time.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. BAIRD: That is Red's view, too.

MR. LLOYD: Yes, that is what he tells me.

MR. STEWART: How do you feel, Von?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Well, Matt talked to me and told me about
25X1A9a the standard, which I recognized, and when we selected [REDACTED] we felt
that he met this standard and would be a good representative.

25X1A9a MR. BAIRD: Is [REDACTED] going to be a Deputy Assistant Director
or Assistant Director?--do you have that in mind? He has probably been
up before this Board more than any single guy in the Agency. His basic
study was in personnel management.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think he would certainly be one of our
senior management people, as an executive.

MR. BAIRD: Don't think that he wouldn't gain from this
particular course, if he were interested in personnel--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The question is, is the guy going up ahead
on the managerial level? If DD/P said he is going to go back to his
old job, I would vote negative, but if DD/P has a job in mind for him
on the managerial level when he comes back then I am for it.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Who can say that twelve months from now
we are going to have another job for him? I can't possibly say it. I
can only say he is material when such jobs open up.

MR. STEWART: I'd like to ask a question in this connection.
We have one candidate for this next fall semester, and that is in, as
I understand it. In view of what you said, Kirk, I gather our standards
are going to be very high, indeed.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Who is next fall's?

25X1A9a [REDACTED].

MR. STEWART: Our standards are going to be very high, indeed,
on selection. I just wonder if we want to run at the rate of two--I
really do. I mean, I think at that high standard and with the workload
the Agency has, you might very well find yourself coming up with a

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

course that you couldn't fill - couldn't propose a candidate who meets these standards.

MR. BAIRD: Gordon, for what it's worth, I think we should give a little more attention to what Red has said. As a result of his being there and discussing this with the Vice-President in charge of this course in the school, he strongly recommends against a second candidate--not against Brent but against a second candidate this time.

MR. STEWART: Wasn't there an "unless"?--"unless he is out-standing"?

MR. BAIRD: No.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: How does Red feel about [REDACTED]

MR. BAIRD: He thinks [REDACTED] will meet it.

25X1A9a
25X1A9a

MR. STEWART: What is the feeling of the Board? Should we vote on [REDACTED] is already on--he is proposed - he's our present candidate. The reason we are nominating a second one is because [REDACTED] in Logistics - his wife is ill and he can't go. We approved two candidates before.

25X1A9a

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let one go, and send [REDACTED] next winter.

[REDACTED] himself is dying to go, and, as you know, he has been led right up to the starting post a number of times.

25X1A9a

MR. STEWART: Well, let's vote he goes the following session.

[REDACTED]: I don't want to vote against whatever seems politic between Red and Harvard here, but if we have a vacancy--these fellows are in two different lines of work and it won't hurt the Agency if they are away.

MR. STEWART: My concern is whether you are going to run out of candidates in the future. I would say let's vote [REDACTED] as our No. 1 candidate for the following course--the one following this one--and that we must make it that way, and, if necessary, we can have a pro forma review of other candidates, and if somebody feels very strongly about

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

putting up another one we can always put in two names.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Have you slept better since you went there, Larry?
Do you agree with Red's recommendation or do you feel differently?

MR. HOUSTON: I feel much the same way. In the first place, I recommend against any more lawyers going up there, because we have had too much of that type of thing already. But it's a good course and I think these other fellows who never had the case history type of teaching should go.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Do you have any feeling about two or one?
MR. HOUSTON: I think one is enough.

25X1A9a MR. KIRKPATRICK: Von, if you came in here today and said, "Let's send [REDACTED] and as soon as he gets back we're going to make him an Assistant Director" - I'd vote in favor of sending him, but in view of the fact you don't know his assignment, I'd say let him stay where he is now until next winter, and maybe by that time he will have a top managerial job. I'm arguing against sending somebody just for the sake of sending somebody.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I have no strong argument whether he goes this time or next time. I think Pete Scoville would prefer to have him go next time, because this is a tough period.

MR. STEWART: All right, let's put him up as No. 1 for the next one.

If there is no objection we will consider the minutes of the last meeting approved.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: This is really new business, but it ties in so closely with this Harvard thing, if you would allow me, I'd like to mention it. I am about to come up with a survey and a recommendation that affects Mr. Baird but also the entire Agency, and that is for the abolition of the 5% rule, which I think has now been carried to the point where it's costing the Agency money because people are trying to live up to it by sending people to courses on international communism,

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

housemaids maintenance, etc. Am I going to run into violent opposition?

MR. BAIRD: From only one person, and he is not in this room.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What do you feel, Dick?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] If it ever had any purpose it has been resolved by now.

MR. STEWART: Are the minutes of the last meeting acceptable?

[No response.]

25X1A9a

I assume [REDACTED] is all right for the Industrial College, as being a perfectly fine man,

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: He was our No. 1 candidate last time. His job fits exactly this matter. He "liases" with the military on industrial matters for the NIS program.

MR. BAIRD: Does that fill our quota?

MR. STEWART: Actually, it runs one over our quota--

MR. BAIRD: I gave you one today. Did you read that? It came in yesterday.

MR. STEWART: Yes, this is an additional candidate. We were told in advance that we were going to get this invitation, so I thought we would settle it right here. So [REDACTED] is the man for this one.

25X1A9a

MR. BAIRD: That makes three?

MR. STEWART: Yes.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] For the Industrial College?

MR. STEWART: Yes.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: Too damn many!

MR. STEWART: Gentlemen, the procedures of coordination call for a final vote on the overtime compensation policy. I do not submit it for discussion, unless someone wishes to raise some aspect of it at this time. If it appears to be all right, I would suggest that we accept it and proceed to publish it.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Mr. Chairman, why was there nothing in

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

here about night duty officers? Didn't we originally have something in there about night duty officers?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Not to my knowledge, General.

MR. STEWART: We did a long time ago--as a matter of fact, I think in the Staff Study I wrote.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The Notices that have covered this expired 1 January 1959 - FN 20-650-1 and FN 20-650-2. My Chief of Admin,

25X1A9a [REDACTED] feels very, very strongly about this.

MR. STEWART: Allow me to take that up as a related subject--

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: He says he understands there is something in revision now.

MR. STEWART: The problem that is central to our discussion here is the one represented in this document, and as it got to be more and more difficult to resolve this one, I just let these other peripheral matters go by the board, with the idea that we would pick them up in the normal course of regulations rewriting and redrafting. But this one where you have an issue of principle, I think belongs before this Board.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I move we accept it as presented and amended.

MR. STEWART: Fine. If there are no objections, we will do that.

The next item is our general separations regulation. It replaces a 10-page printed regulation. The part on voluntary separations need not concern this Council, because it is absolutely boiler plate - just the most ordinary sort of thing, and if there is anything wrong in it we will get it right, if we find out it doesn't work in practice.

The part involving involuntary separations should, I believe, command your attention, and I would ask that we take first a look at the Regulation itself--which is Part II of the separation

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

regulation. Have you had a chance to review it or look it over, or would you rather we read it here? We tried to get it out, but I fear it went out rather late.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I only had one comment on it and that is under Part II, paragraph 3, there are listed all the reasons for nominating people for separation, and it all says, "failure" "failure" "failure" - and it comes down to the end and says, "failure to meet Agency medical standards." There is a stigma there, if all the rest of them are failures of an individual.

MR. STEWART: We could say "inability."

MR. BAIRD: At the risk of prolonging this into a long discussion--and as long as Larry [Houston] is here--it seems to me the guts of whether this thing is going to work or not would be two clauses: (1) the Act itself, that the Director can "whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable..."--and I stress "advisable"--"...in the interests of the United States"--what does it mean? What is the interpretation of that? In other words, is marginal competence "advisable in the interests of the United States" - when you have to cut down on budget and personnel. And "failure to meet the work and efficiency standards of the Agency"--what do you have to do to make a case for meeting the work and efficiency standards of the Agency? If the Director will take the word of the Deputy concerned, the Office Head, on these matters, I think we can use this involuntary separation regulation, and if he can't I don't see that this is any help.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] What is the distinction between this and selection out?

MR. STEWART: Work and efficiency standards is selection out.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: Which is first here, the chicken or the egg--which is the senior procedure, selection out or this?

MR. STEWART: This would cancel the selection-out procedure.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think, Gordon, maybe what Dick is searching

~~SECRET~~

for is the explanation of why we are doing this, which is, in effect, to get out one basic regulation on separations so that from a legal point of view we don't get hoisted on the petard that State got hoisted on in the Service case; in other words, they were caught there because they didn't follow their own regulations. Right at the moment we are in danger of being so caught. So we have been working--Larry and Gordon and myself--with General Cabell to try to get this thing molded around so that we had the simplest possible regulation which said what is required in order to inform an employee of his rights but didn't say so much that the Agency would be caught all the time for not following some clause which a lawyer could catch us on.

MR. STEWART: Dick, there are two authorities the Director has for separating, the authority he has as an appointing officer, and also the authority that is spelled out here in the Act. Now what we say in this is that he is only going to use this authority. Up to the present time our present regulations are based on both, and when you start a fellow on separation out he says, "Why am I not being tried under Regulation 705"--which is this 10 page regulation and which has all of the detailed procedures for appeal, for notification, and all the rest of it, in very great elaboration. Then we always have to say, "We just decided to use the other authority." So my feeling is that we shouldn't refer to any other authority in regulations in this Agency, we should rescind everything else and have one regulation that says what the authority is and how we go about it.

Now, it's very necessary that we explain how we go about it, because we have people who come to us during separation-out exercises and say, "I have no way of defending myself, because there is nothing on paper that tells me what is happening to me." And Larry and I have spent some time in actually writing letters back and forth to people who come to see us--the man says, "You can tell me this but I can't tell this to my lawyer" - so we draft up a letter. Well, if we have it all in here and

~~SECRET~~

settled once and for all how we are doing it, then I think we can handle these cases in somewhat more orderly fashion.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We are now in court on the [REDACTED] case--who was fired because he refused to take a directed assignment on two occasions--and I guess we are going to weather it all right.

25X1A9a

MR. HOUSTON: There is a motion for summary judgment now, which we hope will take care of it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But we damn near got hoisted on our own regulation in that case. And this is exactly what these characters will do - the ones you are going to fire are the ones that will do it. That is why I am voting for Alternative No. II.

MR. HOUSTON: To respond to Matt's question, the only attack that can be made on the exercise of the Director's discretion is an exercise that is capricious or arbitrary. So once he signs off it will probably stand up.

MR. BAIRD: Can a case be made out at the present time when you are cutting down on people--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If they are below standards, yes.

MR. BAIRD: What do you have to do to make such a case?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Prove they are below standards.

MR. BAIRD: Who sets the standards?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You do, as Director of Training.

MR. BAIRD: I know this is the way it is supposed to work, but this is not the way it always works.

[REDACTED] I should think that would be an embarrassing question for a lawyer to ask - "Show me the standards."

MR. STEWART: They have got them in the handbook.

MR. BAIRD: In the description of the job? These are people that haven't had unsatisfactory Fitness Reports.

MR. STEWART: Well, that is a little problem, then. If we don't have the time to make out an unsatisfactory Fitness Report, show

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

it to the fellow and put him on probation, then we are in too much of a hurry.


MR. KIRKPATRICK: This is, basically, really the guts of this thing. If your supervisors don't give them poor Fitness Reports then the odds of getting rid of them are zero. Now, I don't mean 1's on the Fitness Reports - I think we can get rid of 3's.

MR. BAIRD: They are just not good enough when you are trying to do a job that it has taken three men to do, with two men. If you have two men to do the job they have to be topnotch.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Issue a memo tomorrow: Henceforth individuals in the Office of Training with Fitness Reports below the level of 4 will be considered below the standard that will be required--and you have a standard. It's just as simple as that.

MR. STEWART: Matt, I think one of the things we must realize is that this does not provide the answer to what is actually a reduction-in-force. I mean, you can't do it that way. I have tried every means that I can think of to slip reduction in force into this--and Larry and General Cabell--and the Agency just won't sit still for it.

25X1A9a

 It's a dirty word.

MR. STEWART: It's a dirty word. So I put in words about "competitive ratings" - so you start out with your best man and get down to your worst man and say you cut the worst man off--that is a reduction in force.

MR. BAIRD: Is abolition of a job--

MR. STEWART: That is reduction in force.

MR. HOUSTON: We are still working on the reduction-in-force problem, and some of our fellows think maybe we could do it if we got a further test on it, but I'm afraid if a man has a perfectly good work record and you just, say, rate them and cut off the ten lowest ones, that it could be attacked as arbitrary or capricious.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I do hope everybody in this Agency realizes

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

a reduction in force is the most humane way to get rid of people. If you are riffed you can go somewhere and get a job, but if CIA bounces you for anything besides reduction in force, you have really a stigma against your name.

MR. STEWART: We are using the outplacement exercise reasonably well. I have taken two cases recently - I simply told the people that I can't fire them but they have to go, and they have both hunted around and both of them are finding jobs - the one went with the Navy and the other is going with the Library of Congress. This isn't going to be easy with a lot of our intelligence specialists, but it can be done. Sitting across the table with a man is usually the best way to start these things, I think.

Well, are there any other comments on this document?

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: I would vote for Alternative II.

Then in paragraph 4.d. again a "failure" - "fails to meet Agency medical standards." Say "is unable to...." It's in two places.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What about these alternatives in paragraph 2? Do you want any further discussion of that?

MR. STEWART: I think in paragraph 2 of the Regulation - the alternatives - I would appreciate having your views.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me ask Larry: isn't Alternative II a little easier to cope with from a legal standpoint?

MR. HOUSTON: I think so. I like it better.

MR. STEWART: All right.

Also, Larry, you will notice I changed a little bit your notification of opportunity to request consideration--because I actually carried some of it up into the previous paragraph - on the last page here.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Let me ask you a question there, Gordon. I'm not sure I'm clear in my mind as to the difference between the handbook

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

and the regulation. Why do we have both of them?

MR. STEWART: Well, as I understand this process the regulation simply makes a positive statement of what you do and what the responsibilities are, and the handbook tells the story step by step, tells you the procedures, so that a person--for example, Dick wants to tell someone in DDP that they should proceed, he would say, "You just follow the handbook and work up the case."

MR. BAIRD: It's HOW you do it.

MR. STEWART: Yes.

MR. HOUSTON: It's not as important in this regulation as it is in some others - travel, etc.

MR. STEWART: Very well.

Let's move on to the "Management of Personnel in Grades 1 through 15," and let me just say a word of explanation. This is a draft regulation. It presupposes the writing of a handbook in which some of the materials that people have found useful--for example, standards to be used in drawing up efficiency reports, and things of that sort--will be spelled out in a rather didactic way. Here, however, I thought we could pull together the principal factors very central to our personnel program. And I thought that rather than having separate regulations on each of these things, which we have had in the past, it's better to put them all in one, because they relate to one another so clearly.

The new material that is in here--if you could say there is new material--there is one thing, I'm proposing, on page 3, at the top, that the Director of Personnel review and evaluate the records of all personnel selected for promotion from grades 11 to 12 and from grades 13 to 14.

MR. BAIRD: Don't you in effect do that now? You have the authority to do it.

MR. STEWART: I don't like the way it is now. I have the authority, but in a very vague sort of way--I have the authority to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

authenticate actions, which to my way of thinking isn't very good - I want to get the case before its gone that far.

MR. BAIRD: Gordon, I thought I was following the regulation-- before I notify a person that the OTR Career Service Board has recommended their promotion, I say it has been recommended to the Office of Personnel, on the basis that it's up to you to approve it.

MR. STEWART: Well, the practice for years has been the Office of Personnel makes sure the man is here, that what you recommend is proper, in a purely formal sense, that there are no formal objections to it. There is no substantive review of promotions by the Office of Personnel, and never has been, that I can find. Maybe there has been in the past, but certainly not to my knowledge. And what I would intend to do would be to make these two levels--and I have chosen them with care-- thresholds in fact, to encourage the heads of Career Services either to go slow or turn back cases where the record as I turned it up would not seemingly support it in terms of Agency standards.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Is there a reason for not also looking over 12's to 13's?

MR. STEWART: Yes--merely workload. I feel if we can screen from 11's to 12's at least we are screening the people who are entering important levels of professional work in the Agency. Screening for a 14 is a very necessary thing because grade 14 has become, across the board in the Agency, overloaded, in my opinion, with people who clearly do not and never will qualify for promotion to 15. I think if a person is going to be promoted to 14 and it doesn't look like he will ever make a 15, you should hold him back until he is getting well along in his career and use it as a terminal promotion type of thing.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Is this going to be a benevolent or a waspish review?

MR. STEWART: Just read in here how benevolent--I'm not even

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

going to turn them down, I'm going to come over and talk to you.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Why telegraph what you're going to do in a regulation? Why not put that out as a notice to Career Service heads, or something like that?

MR. STEWART: I think that is a good idea.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I'd like to see you review every one of them.

MR. BAIRD: I swear you have that authority.

MR. STEWART: I have that authority.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I believe you have it--granted, also, you haven't done it.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you need a new set of teeth, here it is.

MR. STEWART: I could take this paragraph out of here and carry on just as well, but I think it would take an inordinate amount of explaining when I go to you--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It's okay to do this. This is the sense of the meeting and the sense of the Career Services.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Gordon, can I ask some questions about this? If you put out this, which is a compendium of existing procedures, etc., do you plan to knock the others off the books?

MR. STEWART: All of the others come out.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Some of this actually changes things considerably. For instance, your counseling one here, which looks to me like a CPO [Career Planning Outline] system, but this never even mentioned the CPO--it's not even mentioned in here. So you look at this, and you know the other is on the books and we have been doing it for two years--

MR. STEWART: I'll take care of that in the handbook. I always thought the career planning got too formalized and too wooden in its application in the Agency. So I think we ought to have just a simple statement of what we want to do, and in the handbook I can say

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

you can use the CPO form - that is a matter of election.

To answer your first question, Von, this is a re-write of regulations, and I mean to rescind those regulations that this covers and incorporate any of the detailed things that need to go into it, in a handbook, so that if a person wants to know how we manage personnel in this Agency he can read this regulation and get the answer--at least I hope he does.

And the other bit of new material, if it is new--and I think it is--is the relationship between the Career Service and the operating official with regard to assignments.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] This I don't understand - in paragraph 3.a., the "operating officials"--if it's the same as it has been in other regulations I am both the head of the Career Service and the operating official, so that this paragraph doesn't mean anything. But if the "operating official"--take Bissell's project - I'd have to allocate a certain number of slots to him and he could promote up to a GS-8 and ruin my competitive evaluation in those grades or any other. So I didn't know what it meant--I mean, how it would be applied. Saunders, for instance, has people detailed to me. I'm an "operating official" in that case. Then if he can tell me how many promotions I can make--I don't see how you can have any equity.

MR. STEWART: My understanding of this is--and maybe in some of the technical services it wouldn't work--but our groundrules up to the present time, in regulations, call for a Career Service review of promotions down through grade 9, and below that level there is no particular provision made for review.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: I do it as head clear down to 7.

MR. STEWART: I think you would just have to adjust that.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] If this word was "may" instead of "will"--

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Either "may" or "may indicate".

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] If it isn't mandatory, it's all right.

MR. STEWART: Sure. I'll change that to "may." Very glad to.

I can understand why you would want to watch those levels more carefully.

MR. BAIRD: Paragraph 5.a., "...initial assignment of an employee to a Career Service..." - you would consult the head of the Career Service and the individual, or would this be an arbitrary assignment to a Career Service? The reason I ask, Gordon, is that early in 1952 or 1953, whenever it was, we struggled over this and we did feel that the individual--let's say if the individual and the gaining office were in agreement that that would hold. The individual was given some choice in the matter of what career Service he wanted to be assigned to. And we still have, of course, a lot of categories that I think are illy assigned. I'm struggling with the pilots in [REDACTED] --they are still in my Career Service; also, the special services officers at

25X1C4c

25X1A6a

[REDACTED]

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: If you think you have trouble--all of the fire department and the guards down at [REDACTED] have a Communications designation and are on my T/O!

25X1A6a

MR. BAIRD: They ought to be Logistics.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What is your fire department on, Matt?

MR. BAIRD: WB, fortunately.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I was going to raise the same point, that in a movement between Career Services I think "with the approval of the appropriate Career Service heads" should be added. ✓

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] There should be, mutually, an agreement between the gaining and the losing office, and the individual.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think the Career Service head should be involved in this with you.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. STEWART: Ordinarily they will be. You have the natural market at work all the time. But it's a question--as we all know, we get stuck, and you have to move people from time to time--in which case I would move them. We have that already in the books.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Your initial one is all you have in this regulation.

MR. STEWART: Or his reassignment from one Career Service to another.

Now, this is not to say that anything I don't do is illegal--it simply gives somebody in the Agency authority to make these movements, which I think it has been agreed is necessary. This incorporates the thoughts we had in that little regulation on the Special Placement Committee, which was passed two years ago.

Then I want to call your attention to a sentence further along--

MR. BAIRD: I still don't like that, Gordon. I still think you ought to consult the head of the Career Service concerned and the individual.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I do too.

MR. STEWART: Wouldn't I? Do you think it has to be written in there?

MR. BAIRD: I do.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I do too.

MR. STEWART: What do you think, Kirk?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I don't think it would hurt to say the initial assignment or reassignment will be made by the head of Personnel--I'd leave the individual out. I'm a little against that form of communism that you consult the individual.

MR. STEWART: Okay--after consultation with the head of the Career Service.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It's in the initial assignment this is done--not by the Director of Personnel but by his people.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] This is your appointing authority, isn't it?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We recruit people we know are going to be assigned to us.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: You [indicating Mr. Stewart] can just call up Baird and say, "I'm going to assign this fellow to you." Baird can say, "I don't want him." Then you can say you've "consulted" Baird.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I have read Mr. Bissell's philosophy that there shall be no monopoly in any component on doing anything, and he believes that if a project comes up then funds and personnel should be transferred from one component to another component to do that particular work. And I don't think my people want to be transferred from a Career Service designation of Communications to something else--and under the present regulations the individual has to agree. This of course doesn't cover this for reassignments.

MR. STEWART: Well, I don't know of his philosophy.

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: I have read it in writing--and I know

25X1A9a [REDACTED] has spoken of it. I have one case - [REDACTED] and

25X1A2d1

25X1A2d1 [REDACTED] - he wants to transfer the responsibility of that to TSS, and I'm assuming he wants to transfer my people over to TSS--and with you [indicating Mr. Stewart] consulting with the head of the Career Service will give me an opportunity to put in my plea.

MR. LLOYD: Which Career Service are you consulting with - the gaining or the losing?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would say both.

MR. LLOYD: Then that should read "the Career Services."

MR. STEWART: Yes, we can do that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Are you happy, Baird?

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. BAIRD: I'm chuckling over the benign mood [REDACTED] is in this afternoon.

25X1A9a

MR. STEWART: I have one other thing that has not been defined before but I think needs definition, and that is the relation of heads of Career Services to operating officials. It reads here in paragraph 5.c. "Heads of Career Services will assign personnel to operating units with primary emphasis upon the aptitudes, experience, and skills required...." and so on, and then it's up to the operating official to assign the person to the job. There can be some agreement or understanding between the two as to which job it is the man is being picked up for, but it has always been my feeling that the person who has the work to do should be responsible for who does it. Once a Career Service, such as the Personnel Career Service, has assigned a man to you, [REDACTED] you can decide whether he goes in this job or that job.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] And if you assign me a Personnel Officer and I assign him to do something else, then if I ask you for another one you can say, "I gave you one."

What does the word "assign" mean? How can I "assign" personnel to an operating official--assuming the operating official has to be somebody other than myself. I "detail" - I "assign" or "detail."

MR. STEWART: You get down to some pretty fine points here. There is actually one action cut--you offer the man, he puts him in the position. There are two concepts involved but there is only one action cut, the assignment to the place he is going. The authority to give the man this particular position rests with the operating official; the responsibility to offer the man to the operating official - that responsibility rests with the head of the Career Service.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: "Detail" is the correct word. In other

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

words, from a Career Service a man should be "detailed" for what is in effect a "tour of duty" with an operating official, and then he returns to his Career Service.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] That certainly is not the way we use "detail" around the Agency now.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I say it's used wrong, yes. Basically all of Gordon's people not in the Office of Personnel are detailed to other offices for tours and are then returned to their basic assignment.

MR. STEWART: Well, we will wrestle with the semantic details and get it out.

Can we turn now to the Civilian Reserve Programs? Only one thing is requested and that is that we go ahead with the "pen pal" letters re the Civilian Standby Reserve--which is in paragraph 3. It looks pretty good to me. I see no particular reason not to go ahead with it.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: I agree.

I have one difficulty here, and I haven't been able to solve it. My greatest need is cryptographers. Here it says "no Agency-sponsored training."

MR. STEWART: We can put them in the Specialist Reserve.

This is actually designed more for Dick's people, who would not have to be called in for training but with whom we wish to stay in touch.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] And we do too.

MR. STEWART: Yes, you have a lot of them too. And you can call them consultants and call them in any time you want to. And you can transfer them between these programs.

MR. BAIRD: Gordon, are we kept up to date on the status of that--when we put a bunch of names in? I would think it would be helpful.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a [REDACTED] How does this operate--when you correspond with them every six months what do you send them?--a form letter saying, "Are you alive? Report any change of address"?

MR. STEWART: That is right, that's about the size of it.

MR. BAIRD: Is twice a year too much?

25X1A9a [REDACTED]: What's wrong with once a year. Six months go by awfully fast.

MR. STEWART: All right, once a year. I'll settle for that. ✓

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I just have a factual question, and if you can't answer it I'll search elsewhere, but I was impressed by the tremendously high fall-out-[REDACTED] nominated and [REDACTED] disqualified. And those are former employees. If they were applicants I could understand that. This seems an awfully high percentage. And this isn't the operating unit that is disqualifying them.

25X9A2

25X9A2

MR. STEWART: I'll have to look into it. I really don't have the answer. I noticed the big fall-out. I think it shows there were a lot of people who were held in high esteem by their colleagues here, and their colleagues don't know why they left. Security on some separations is well maintained--including their medical, etc.

Anything further on this? [No response.]

All right, shall we go ahead?

MR. BAIRD: You're passing over this Specialist Reserve?

MR. STEWART: It's just a report of information on that.

MR. BAIRD: I was just going to ask [REDACTED] whether he still wanted those slots?

25X1A9a

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I can't fill them. If you can use them you can have them.

MR. BAIRD: This was the purpose of my question.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What are you going to have to do, [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

25X1A9a [REDACTED] make your own cryptographers?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] It will take about eight months. And

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

the only thing we will have to do is take wives of people here in the Agency--wives became Gray Ladies in the last war, and that sort of thing--and give them rapid training. And it should be easier to clear them than to go out and get recruits and clear them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Should we do that now?--be doing it?

25X1A9a
25X1A9a [REDACTED] We talked to [REDACTED] a great deal about this, before he left, and he was hoping that he could get sort of a canvass of the elements which won't go overseas, such as the DD/I, who will be here all the time, and see if the wives who have children in school, and that sort of thing--or who are married and away from home--see if they wouldn't be willing to come in and take some on-the-job training right here in town.

MR. STEWART: We will follow up on that.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me if this is what you have estimated as your minimum reserve requirement, we ought to have it coped with.

MR. BAIRD: You would entertain my request for those slots?

MR. STEWART: We would consider the slots of [REDACTED] 25X1A9a released, yes.

The next item concerns the Civil Service. I have several things I merely want to introduce and discuss here.

We plan to ask the new Chairman and a couple of other people from Civil Service to go down to [REDACTED] as we did with the other Chairman. And we have been thinking for some time of discussing with them an exchange arrangement between Civil Service and the Agency. 25X1A6a The only reason for doing it is to ease the problem of out-placement. Whether we can get a good arrangement and one we would like to live with, or not, I don't know. I have had a careful study made of the AEC arrangement, and others that exist in the Government, and there are a number of things that looked rather tricky to me. However, the grounds for going ahead I think I can spell out rather quickly. First is to

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

obtain recognition of the merit personnel program existing in CIA. That would be a need. Secondly, to establish a method by which personnel can move, after years of service with CIA, to other Federal organizations without having to go through an examining process designed for entrance into the Federal service. Now, this is quite a technical matter. Some of your examinations are open all the time. Some people we handle in out-placement if they have the right qualifications they can go into these rather open fields and be examined and taken on at a good pace. For example, the Navy Department administers examinations in certain personnel fields, and we found that worked very well for some of our people. However, in other fields your rosters are pretty well loaded with 10 point veterans, and the hiring agencies are called upon to give those people first whack. And in order to get our people in any kind of competitive status it would be of great assistance to have them automatically go into this system without having to wait for an examination. Also, some examinations are given quite infrequently. A man might be available now but he would have to wait until an examination is, in fact, given.

Then, to place substantially all CIA employees on an equal footing with status employees - career or career-conditional - of other agencies for inter-agency transfer purposes.

I think I've covered the main features of this thing.

All I want now is to hear any objections, if they exist, if they occur to you, to exploring this thing. We certainly can't make an arrangement until we have gone into it in detail, and we certainly can't predict in advance how much we are getting into. One of the very first things we will do is sit down with Larry and his lawyers and see what the effect of the Veterans' Preference Act is, whether, for example, we would have to rewrite certain of our own internal regulations to measure up to legal standards, whether we would

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

get ourselves more hidebound than we want. Our status under the Veterans' Preference Act--I think I can quote you on this, Larry--is really in some respects pretty well unknown. We haven't actually tested where we stand--and we might be opening this thing up for a clear-cut decision: are we or are we not involved - in making certain types of appointments do we have to follow Veterans' standards. If we get into it far enough and find we are getting ourselves hamstrung, I think we might just have to draw out of it.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Can't we leave that unknown? I can't see we would do anything except lose. I can't see that we could improve the situation from what it is now, and I can only conceive of it being more restrictive than it is.

MR. HOUSTON: Right now the Civil Service Commission has taken the position it really has no jurisdiction whatsoever--and that is fine, but we have had no personnel situation where it can be tested.

MR. STEWART: In making an arrangement like this I look upon it as an advantage--

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] (Interrupting): This is for addition to your out-placement program?

MR. STEWART: That is the only reason for it, Dick. If we get into it the Civil Service Commission would have to take a look at our job standards in the Agency--

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Some job standards, not all.

MR. STEWART: --and they would get in the position of telling us how to regulate certain matters, and in fact the question of where we stand under the Veterans' Preference Act might very well come up in the course of this, because a person transferring from Civil Service status to us might have, under such an agreement, certain rights to be protected, and if you had to protect those rights you might have to legislate internally to protect them. So it's not the

~~SECRET~~

*the negative
suggested by*

~~SECRET~~

easiest one we've come up with.

MR. HOUSTON: This is a little new to me. You say you are coming to us?

MR. STEWART: I am coming to you. As a matter of fact, we have just had a preliminary study made of the thing--a rather technical study--and these are some of the questions that were raised. It's not for sure this would happen.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: This idea actually emanated from Rocco Siciliano at the White House, when he was at [REDACTED] and Gordon was talking to him about the difficulty of moving senior people to make room for younger ones, and he said, "Why can't you rotate them laterally across the Government?" There would be a group of types of jobs for which other Government agencies have need, and I imagine you would go in the Civil Service roster for those types of jobs and when his number comes up the guy can slot over. But I think if this opens up the Veterans' Preference Act that Messieurs Houston & Company will have to look at it fairly carefully to make sure we don't walk into a booby trap.

25X1A6a

MR. STEWART: I would certainly recommend to the Council that we go ahead and at least explore and see what the problems are.

MR. BAIRD: Vote that you explore.

MR. STEWART: Okay.

[The next one is the Agency Retirement Board.

Sometime ago [REDACTED] described to me the system they used in the Forestry Service in which they expected every person reaching voluntary retirement age to come before a board or talk with someone, and make it pretty clear whether that person had a job continuing for five years, ten years, or whatever else, or should he plan to retire at the time he reached the retirement age. Their rather consistent practice, up to a certain point, was that everyone did retire when they reached voluntary retirement age. We are hoping, of course,

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

to get early retirement age legislation which will reduce the voluntary retirement age, and in that case we will most certainly need a mechanism for deciding who does and who doesn't retire. That sounds a little odd - it doesn't sound very voluntary, but you have to do something to support your personnel program under such legislation. We also have at the present time a number of people who are in fact reaching voluntary retirement age.

I would suggest that I establish a Board. I would think I would certainly need a lawyer on it, and I would certainly need a doctor on it, because I want to have the legal and medical aspects of these cases carefully looked into. Other members of the Board might meet from time to time. I would think that perhaps one representative of each of the Deputies could suitably sit on such a Board. The Board would not concern itself with the discussions held day by day in each of the cases, but would review the work of the Executive Secretary. It is my intention to appoint or to nominate [REDACTED] who is now working for [REDACTED] in that position, and to have him, immediately upon taking that job next September, start to go through all the files of people reaching this age and making the decision whether we talk to them or not.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

One of the problems, which is commonplace to every business and agency, is that it's an awkward thing to take the subject up, and it's particularly awkward if no provision is made for doing it automatically. If everyone in the Agency knows when they reach age 60 the question is going to be raised: should you or shouldn't you stay? --then obviously it's less awkward to introduce the subject if they know this is going to be raised than if the man thinks, "Well, why did they suddenly decide I should be the person to be talked to, and nobody else gets talked to about this." And anyone who has talked to people reaching that age knows exactly what that reaction is. So it's my

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

recommendation that we go ahead on this basis.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think that is a very good idea, Gordon. I just thought the Council might be interested in - do we talk about getting legislation for early retirement. Last week we had Fred Belen and Charlie Johnson from the House Civil Service Committee down. Belen has been up there for twelve or thirteen years now.

MR. HOUSTON: Since 1938.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: And I precipitated this question by saying we were considering legislation for early retirement based on a program of accelerated credit for service overseas, whereupon Belen went into a lengthy dissertation as to the many pitfalls it faces, starting off by saying that ever since the Committee had given the FBI an accelerated retirement program they had regretted it because it had created a favored class in the Federal structure, and the Committee was very edgy now about any advances made for any of these types of programs. He didn't close the door completely, but he did mention that among the conditions they would seek, in any proposal we presented, was that we took care of the financial aspect as best we could before it came up--pointing up what many people say on the hill all the time, as reflected by Jerry Kluttz and the Congressional Record, that the Federal retirement fund is falling further and further behind the potential claims that can be made upon it. It's billions of dollars behind now. So I just wanted to point out that it might be a long distance between drinks on this one, and it might be many, many years before we ever got this legislation through. So maybe with the climate as reflected by him, I don't think, on the basis of this discussion, that we should really count on it for too much. We may get it through, but I think it would have to be proved that we were not then becoming a special class or a special category. And certainly the argument that appealed to them as most valid was the one to keep the organization young, not as credit for serving overseas with the necessity of moving people out when they got

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

back here.

MR. STEWART: I thought their response on that point was sound and good. The question of financing it really does seem to be the hot potatoe. The position taken by Siciliano was that the retirement fund should be used for management purposes. If the Government wants to retire certain people, it should look to the fund to retire them, and if the fund needs more money the Congress should vote more money for the fund. It was that simple. However, they have warned me that everybody else in town, with the sole exception of themselves, has developed a very rigid view about retirement, that retirement is a right people pay for by putting in their 6%, and those people who put in their 6% shouldn't be expected to pay for special privileges of other people--and the same point that Belen brought up about the FBI - they feel very bad about that, and the postal inspectors are on them, everybody is on them.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] What happens with the Air Force, for example?

MR. STEWART: The Services are in an entirely different thing.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Who pays for them?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: They beckon and the Congress gives them the money, and the money goes into Ft. Knox.

MR. STEWART: The military services--of course, they pay that out of current appropriations, don't they?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is right.

MR. HOUSTON: It's not contributory, it's just appropriations.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] What would it cost us to do that?

MR. STEWART: Plenty. As a matter of fact, I had a bright idea last year that we could take people at age 50, retire them, and then we would pay them an equal amount for the next 12 years--and when you start adding that up for a couple hundred people, it comes to a whopping bill. It comes to 45 or 50% of your payroll for those people,

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

and that is a lot of money. But it has to come from somewhere.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I can't draw any retired pay, and I have earned that retired pay by being always available, and I couldn't resign during any war, and so on.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I can tell you, if we ever went up there for this we would get the worst shellacking in history. Congressman Rutherford of Odessa, Texas, is a constant hammer at this business of getting out of control. He would see this coming from way off.

And this, incidentally, may affect our whole view of the Career Service program.

MR. STEWART: 1962 is the year we should have it. In 1962 people will have served 20 years, and at the conclusion of 20 years we should be in a position to retire certain numbers of people. So we have to fight along to get it.

Another thing that Siciliano said was that with the Foreign Service they had strongly advised Mr. Henderson to ask for the authority in law to retire people at younger ages, for a limited number of years--that is, five years--during which the Foreign Service would get itself straightened out. And he made, apparently to him, and to us, no bones about the fact the Foreign Service is in its present mess because they haven't used the authorities they presently have, and have such a tremendous number of people crowding up in those middle and upper grades. And they said, very politely, to us, "And we realize you are in the same fix, not because of mismanagement but because you had to hire these people in order to get into business." They strongly advised that we might ask for a limited period of time during which we would effect these retirements on annuity.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The other point he made was that there must be a provision for involuntary retirement, too.

MR. STEWART: Definitely. I don't think there is any

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

question about that. Lawton said that when we talked to him, and everybody has said that.

I think one way or another we can come up with something, and at our next meeting I hope to be able to give you a good statistical hoedown on the Agency. We have been working very hard to get an idea how we stand now and how we will look in the future--taking the actuarial figures, what the age groupings will be, how badly we're going to hurt in terms of need for retirement legislation, and what the various types of legislation will do for us--so that we will have some grounds for coming up with a sound recommendation.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Gordon, may I ask a question, which is not really as unpleasant as it sounds, but why, if we sit around this table day after day and talk about early retirement legislation, and all those things, do we bother to set up any Retirement Board like this at all?

MR. STEWART: You have to select them out. You can't retire a man until he reaches the mandatory retirement age of ~~60~~.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: ~~60~~ or 62?

MR. STEWART: Depending on length of service--but the mandatory retirement age is ~~60~~. 70

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] It isn't 62? I thought everybody had to get out at 62.

MR. STEWART: That proves you belong to a young service.

MR. BOARD: If this Board can retire people who reach 62 and don't want to retire, I'm all for it.

. . . . Mr. Houston left the meeting

MR. KIRKPATRICK: The postscript to this was some very, very interesting comments by Belen on the technique of getting the bills through, and that is, "Don't spring them on us. Let us work with you

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

in writing." He said one thing that Committee has apparently gotten to hate is the Administration clutching something to its bosom, and then pushing it out with a great deal of publicity.

MR. STEWART: I guess I will be spending a great many hours with Mr. Belen next year.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Can't we adopt an Agency regulation that everybody retires at age 62?

MR. STEWART: Dick, we don't have the authority to do it.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Doesn't the Director?

MR. STEWART: No. He would have to declare in each case that this man has to leave in the interests of the United States, and his decision, in terms of a Government personnel action, could not be capricious; in fact, it couldn't be based on age, it would have to be based on some other factor.

MR. BAIRD: Is this Board going to start functioning next Monday?

MR. STEWART: I thought in September, if that is soon enough. I can possibly get going a little sooner. But I can get at it sooner--in fact, I will personally take any case that needs to be handled. But I would get into it systematically in September. But I would be glad to get with you on any case you had, Matt.

Let me quickly get into the next point, which is the use of grades 6, 8, and 10.

Dick, your people have proposed that these grades be used in all cases, and so has OCR. This has not been accepted generally in the Agency, although I believe you [indicating [REDACTED]] already use some of these grades.

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Except we don't use 10 very often--and I have always thought this was wrong, particularly when you begin to slow down on promotions. If a man can go from 9 to 10 he would like it better than waiting a long time to go from 9 to 11. I'm all for the 10.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think this takes on a virtue as promotions have slowed down - it at least gives a sense of motion.

MR. STEWART: Let me just argue against it, because I personally don't like it and I think I have some good reasons. In the first place, it means too many Board meetings and too much extra paper work, if you do it uniformly. In the second place, positions traditionally are set at two grade intervals, and it's very difficult to define GS-8 and 10 levels--what are you talking about when you promote a person into those levels? I know in your Service, [REDACTED]

25X1A9a

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] you have those jobs, but in other Services, particularly in junior professional levels, the difference between a 7 and 8 is even less significant than the difference between an 11 and 12--which I have always had a hard time figuring out. And it's contrary to the Hoover Commission's recommendation. It's the extra time, expense, paperwork involved in making fine distinctions. In my own opinion, with the number of grades we have now a Board rarely knows what it means to promote from one grade to the next, with the result--in the particularly difficult ones to assess--people tend to slide up gradually. That is one reason I put in here the review when going from grade 11 to 12, and 13 to 14, because I want to slow them down there, and make sure there are definite hurdles.

Then, of course, two grade promotions are general in the Government. Grades 8 and 10 are held in disrepute among professional employees in the Government. This just happens to be part of the folklore of Government.

Also, we decrease the prestige of each promotion, so that promotions in themselves don't mean very much.

Those are the reasons I have against them.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Isn't basically the only valid reason you have there--if you will excuse the expression--the one that it increases the workload and the Board work? If we didn't do anything the Hoover

~~SECRET~~

Commission recommended against, we wouldn't do half the things that we are doing. I think we all agree the fault is the GS system. The way to correct that is to have the Director write his own GS system and eliminate half of the grades.

MR. STEWART: We have discussed that, and this Council agreed that was the direction we wanted to go in, and I thought if we get our manpower control system operating and working, I would like to go ahead on that--which would be in another direction, which is to have fewer grades and actually to have in-grade promotions, more steps within grade.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: There is quite a difference between an in-step and a promotion. People consider an in-step almost a right, and a promotion an honor.

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~ Actually, the money involved between 8 and 10 would be the same as an in-grade. I mean, it's ludicrous when you look at it--we notice the steps on the payscale are thinner.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I like the point Dick made that we are stagnated in promotions--just as a surcease here to allow some sense of motion.

MR. STEWART: I have stated my position, and I would only like to say one other thing, and that is let's go at it experimentally. If it works, fine, and if we find it's tying people up, let's cork it off.

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~ Why is 6 and 8 included? Doesn't anybody but me have 6's and 8's?

MR. STEWART: They go from 7 to 9 ordinarily, among the professionals.

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~: We usually go 7, 9, 11.

25X1A9a

~~SECRET~~ That is what we call a journeyman level, and then the junior supervisory level is an 8. If he's just a

~~SECRET~~

journeyman he's a 7, and if he has several people under him he becomes an 8.

25X1A9a MR. STEWART: I thoroughly agree with the application to yours [indicating [REDACTED] 7, because I think you have the concepts to back it up--you know what these positions mean.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] The whole Office understands that, too. A promotion from 7 to 8 is considered Sergeant to Master Sergeant.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: What grade do you bring the JOT's in?

MR. BAIRD: 7's.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I think it's particularly important that these younger men don't go up too fast.

MR. BAIRD: They still go up fast. But it's that many more pieces of paper during an interim of two years.

MR. LLOYD: You don't think you could spread that out and have a longer time in grade?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] You would have to set new time-in-grade standards.

MR. STEWART: I don't like time in grade.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Is it a question of paper and a question of records management? I mean, the number of pieces of paper now is probably twice as many as we need.

MR. STEWART: Dick, my real objection is this: that if you can slow down the number of meetings you have to hold in order to promote, if you can take the actions more seriously and do a better job of screening, I think you're better off--and the more meetings you have the less seriously any promotion board or panel is going to take these actions. Anytime you load a panel, they're going to start going fast.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] My point was, if I analyze the thing accurately, that we're getting sort of stuck - there aren't many vacancies, therefore

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

the whole fast promotion business of the past is pretty much over. In other words, the vacancies aren't there to accommodate many people, therefore you're going to tend to get in the same position that the grades 16 to 17 are in, and that is that it's harder than for a camel to get through the eye of a needle.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] We won't get as stagnant as the situation I was in--I was 17 years as a Captain, under a seniority system.

MR. STEWART: I would say if any Career Service wants to go ahead on this--

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I think that would be dangerous--if we let OCR do this while next door in ORR they're promoted to 11's. I think we ought to do it Agency-wide, not make it permissive Agency-wide. It's an Agency policy, it seems to me, and not simply one to be tried in one group.

MR. STEWART: How does the DD/I feel about it? Actually, in the DD/I aren't you beginning to do this?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I have kept them from doing it, on the basis that it was going to be discussed here.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I don't use the 10. I think I have only one or two, and one was a hangover from years ago.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I move it be an Agency policy. Let's have a vote on it and adjourn.

MR. BAIRD: Can I ask when your system that we got briefed on--that you gave a briefing on some months ago--lateral grades and diminution of the number of grades, and in-steps--

MR. STEWART: I thought I would let the 20-250 stay on the books about a year.

MR. BAIRD: Can't we wait and see how that works?

MR. STEWART: Yes. I have to see whether the heads of Career Services are going to apportion the number of promotions they allow each year, and all the rest of it--because you either have one

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

set of controls or you have another set of controls, and you can't find yourself half-way in between. And if we can establish good management controls under our present system of grades, I would feel confident in going ahead and introducing the pay plan. The pay plan is the logical next step.

MR. BAIRD: I would like not to bring in the 6, 8, and 10's beyond what are already in, until you have a chance to see whether that system would work.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Then you move that we defer until January 1961 further consideration?

MR. BAIRD: Not the way you put it, but I would vote that we try the other first.

25X1A9a

██████████ What's wrong with trying this on an experimental basis and see how this works - across-the-board throughout the Agency?

MR. STEWART: Throughout the Agency?

MR. LLOYD: It might be a good idea.

25X1A9a

██████████ It would be pretty tough to pull out of without knitting up a lot of raveled sleeves behind you.

MR. STEWART: It's going to hurt some of the out-placement business, because people don't go into these odd ball grades.

MR. LLOYD: Is it done anywhere else?

MR. STEWART: Practically not. No, those grades are not used.

25X1A9a

██████████ Well, if it's going to cause horror in the ranks I suppose there is no real reason for really pushing it. There seemed to be a reasonable ground swell in favor of it, and I thought it might have some benefits accruing to it.

MR. STEWART: I think there are both pros and cons. I don't know how it would work out.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We have two motions on the table, one that it be adopted as an Agency policy, and one that it be adopted as an

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

experimental policy on an Agency-wide basis--and from Baird that we defer it until January 1961.

MR. STEWART: Let's take the second--

MR. BAIRD: I don't see how we could do the second one.

MR. STEWART: We could do it.

MR. BAIRD: Then the Agency gets cluttered up with 8's and 10's.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] But you're not going to reclassify jobs in these areas?

MR. STEWART: I'm not going to reclassify any jobs.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] That could very well happen from this.

MR. STEWART: A person in a grade 7 job could be promoted to grade 8 and then 9--isn't that what you have in mind?--and you're just holding him back; or, saying it another way, you are putting him forward a little bit, and then a little bit more. You are doing it in two steps rather than one.

MR. LLOYD: You're taking two bites at the cherry. You're going to stretch it out a little longer.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] Yes--simply because I think we will have less vacancies.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems to me that this is something that can be done by each unit that wants to do it, with the Office of Personnel monitoring it, and if a unit or the Office of Personnel feels it is getting out of hand, we will stop it.

MR. BAIRD: Your 8 will occupy a 9 authorization?

MR. STEWART: Yes. He can't occupy a 7.

Von, would you settle for that?

25X1A9a [REDACTED] So long as we all go into it. We recommend that we do it as the DD/I unit, and not one office of the DD/I.

25X1A9a [REDACTED] I can't see getting into violent acrimony over the competitive aspects of this--either we all do it or not do it.

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Would you [indicating Mr. Stewart] issue the call, as it were?

MR. STEWART: Let's have a vote. I gather the motion is to do this experimentally?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Just orally. Why put out a paper--you have the representatives of the Agency here.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think there is a virtue in putting something down as to how to administer it. There has been a fair amount of differences of opinion right here.

MR. STEWART: The DD/P has a paper already started on it, and we can issue one in DD/I and DD/S--or an Agency one. Why don't you leave that up to me.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Again, I think uniformity is a terribly important thing when you're dealing with people's pay.

MR. STEWART: Right.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: But we just passed an overtime regulation which does exactly the opposite.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Who likes it?

MR. STEWART: We have discussed that before.

One final item, which I'm sure will not require discussion. A person who is nominated for separation will automatically be suspended from the Career Staff. This was a decision taken by the Selection Board, and it is referred to the Council for confirmation. A person nominated for selection out will automatically be suspended from the Career Staff during the process of hearings and so on. He may resign, he may be reassigned, he may be selected out or separated, but only after the whole process is completed will we re-examine his status as a member of the Career Staff.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, if he is nominated for selection out he may permanently lose his career status, even though by some quirk he may be retained in the Agency?

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. STEWART: That is right. You would have to take positive action through the selection procedure to be reestablished as a career employee.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I thought the connotation meant held in abeyance--

MR. STEWART: After the personnel action is over and it is decided he is out or he will be kept on, we would then resolve his suspension.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I think I have been sending over recommendations that they be removed from the Career Staff.

MR. STEWART: Well, possibly. I felt that it would serve every purpose to suspend the man.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I agree. That means he technically could be reinstated.

MR. STEWART: I feel if you're going to remove a man from the Career Staff, in the light of our present regulations we would have to go through positive review of the Career Staff action--well, we would be doing that at the same time we are reviewing the person's employment.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Well, whatever advantage has accrued to him by membership in the Career Staff, is not lost by the fact he is suspended, I trust.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Not if he is reinstated.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] But adjudication of his case is during the time he is suspended, and that is the time that membership in the Career Staff might be a very important factor in deciding his case.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, his Career Service has said, "We want him out."

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I don't think we can forget that a man is a member of the Career Staff when we decide to fire him from the Agency for any reason.

~~SECRET~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

~~SECRET~~

MR. STEWART: We don't forget it, we take positive action - we suspend him. This regulation on separations says I will consider all factors, favorable and unfavorable.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In other words, he's out of his own Career Service so Gordon is suspending him from the Agency Career Service. If the DD/P Career Service says, "We don't want this boy anymore" - then Gordon suspends him from the Agency Career Service at that point--which seems to me completely valid and reasonable.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] I was pointing out the fact that if Career Staff membership is worth anything it's worth something up to the point you make a decision that a man is going to leave the Agency, not when his case is starting.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]: The fact that he has gotten himself in this fix is the governing thing.

MR. STEWART: I think it's a grave thing when the Career Service nominates the fellow for selection out.

MR. BAIRD: There was that provision originally, that he could be selected in and he could be selected out.

MR. STEWART: We can select them out, but you see that puts us through another, duplicatory process. This is to avoid having the second one.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED] Do we have to vote it?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: We're all agreed. Move we adjourn.

MR. STEWART: The meeting stands adjourned.

. . . . The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

~~SECRET~~